

Remarks

[0001] Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-30 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 1, 11, and 21. Claims withdrawn or cancelled herein are 9, 19, and 29. New claims added herein are None.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0003] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on June 6, 2007. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0004] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited art, namely U.S. Patent No. 6,615,219 to Bruso. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0005] The Examiner was receptive to the proposals, and I understood the Examiner to indicate that the proposed clarifying claim amendments appeared to distinguish over the cited art of record. For example, the Examiner indicated that

clarification regarding the inclusion of a lifetime distinguished claim 1 over the cited art, namely Bruso. However, the Examiner indicated that she would need to review the cited art more carefully and/or do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

[0006] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0007] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0008] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments and Additions

[0009] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 11, and 21 herein.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 112

[0010] Claims, 5-6, 15-16, and 25-26 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner withdrawing the pending objections to the aforementioned claims

Claim Rejections under §§ 102

[0011] Claims 1-4, 7-10, 11-13, 14, 17-24 and 27-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,615,219 by Bruso et al. (hereinafter "Bruso"). In light of the amendments presented herein and the decisions/agreements reached during the above-discussed Examiner interview, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

[0012] In particular, the following elements (emphasized for clarity) added to claim 1 are not disclosed (each of the remaining independent claims having been also amended to include similar elements) by the prior art reference relied upon by the Examiner.

1. (Currently Amended): A method for handling a large data object in a computer system, said method comprising:

creating a handling structure comprising a reference to locate the large data object and information to return an interface to provide access to the large data object, wherein said handling structure has a lifetime, and said handling structure comprising a field having a value corresponding to said lifetime;

wherein said handling structure can be processed by said computer system, via functions, operations, and so forth available for a small data object, with which said large data object could not be so processed.

[0013] Bruso does not disclose the aforementioned claim elements. The Examiner relies upon portions of Bruso to teach these elements, namely column 4, lines 29-35 and column 4, lines 38-40. Instead of teaching the element of a lifetime, Bruso instead discloses creation of a time stamp which is the time at which BLOB is created in the memory storage area. (*See* Column 4, lines 29-35) The creation time stamp is used to validate the ownership of a BLOB image by its 'owning' row. *Id.* The creation time of the row must match the creation time of the corresponding BLOB. *Id.*

[0014] The creation time of Bruso is different than the "lifetime" element of the present application. In the present application, the "lifetime" property describes the length of time a BLOB Handle reference is valid. (*See* Paragraph [0042]). Bruso does not disclose anything about the property of the lifetime which corresponds to either query lifetime or row lifetime.

[0015] Independent claims 11 and 21 have been amended to include similar claim language. As such, each claim is allowable for the aforementioned reasons as outlined for claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2-8, 10, 12-18, 20, 22-28 and 30

[0016] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim that are allowable. As discussed above the independent claims are allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

[0017] Applicant would propose that dependent claims 2, 12 and 22 are also clearly allowable. Bruso does not disclose that a first large data object is copied by the creation of a second handling structure that points to the same large data object provided that the first handling structure and the second handling structure do not write a change to the first large data object.

[0018] Bruso discloses that a Blob which is stored as a very large string of binary digits that are handled as objects. Bruso includes BLOB identifiers that include an address code, a length code, and a cyclic redundancy check (CRC). But Bruso does not describe about a first handling structure pointing to a first large data object that is virtually copied by the creation of a second handling structure that points to the same first large data object provided that the first handling structure and the second handling structure do not write a change to the first large data object.

Conclusion

[0019] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: June 15 2007

By: _____


Jason F. Lindh
Reg. No. 59090
(509) 324-9256 x215
jason@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com

My Assistant: Carly Bokarica
(509) 324-9256 x264
carly@leehayes.com